1:Vaillant A-5 (1928-1936)1941 NU7 Aztec NU7

CHAPTER VI

THE MAN AND THE TRIBE

In which are set forth the basic ideas of Aztec education, government, law and social customs

642 618 THE SOCIAL ORGANIZATION of the Aztec tribes was in theory completely democratic. An individual was a member of a family which, in turn, belonged to a cluster of families or a clan.* Theoretically twenty of these clans made up a tribe, each of them regulating its own affairs but, in matters of tribal importance, joining with the others in a council composed of all the leaders. The council appointed one chief to control civil and religious affairs and usually a second for war. Originally designed for simple farming communities and presumably of an antiquity dating back to Middle Culture times, this organization later ramified into the governmental complexity of a populous and highly complicated city-state.[1]

844 The working of a community is best illustrated by the position of the individual in it, a process which is described in the third part of the Codex Mendoza. Immediately a child was born it was washed and swaddled by a midwife. Since 777 the gods governed the fate of man on earth, the parents con- 787 sulted a priest who looked in the *tonalamatl*,† or book of

*The term clan is used to mean a tribal division without connotation of male or female descent.

†To'-na-la-matl

1:Vaillant A-5 (1928-1936)1941 NU7 Aztec NU7

562 alliance. Moreover, marriages were carefully arranged be-
[584] tween families, so that for a husband grossly to neglect his wife's rights was a breach, if not of etiquette, certainly of
[793] social contract. The priesthood may have offered a modest field of influence and attainment to women. However, history records no mention of any advantage deriving from temple service.

554 Men had the chief opportunities, and these lay in various
555 directions. The early chroniclers, conditioned by their mediæval Spanish background, spoke of hereditary classes. In all probability, judging from Indian communities as a whole, there was *rank* but not *class* in the hereditary sense. As in our own society, a man could attain high *rank* through his own efforts, and through his eminence his children would consequently profit in their own social adjustment. Yet they could not reach their father's position unless they earned it through
[556] equivalent tribal service. *Wealth* did exist, and property in the form of rights to use land, tools and other possessions
• [642 421] created a social and economic stratification. In theory and practice Aztec society was democratic, and the communal ownership of productive property was its economic base.[4]

555 A man attained rank through the measure of his tribal service. The wise farmer, the wily hunter, the brave warrior or the dexterous artisan gained admiration from his fellows because of superior skill. If his wisdom and judgment were conspicuous he might be elected as the clan representative to the tribal council, or even as chief. Similarly an individual who dedicated himself to learning the magic rituals to placate the gods, could become a medicine man or priest. However, in the populous and advanced city-states activities tended to become specialized, and greater opportunity led to a more

1:Vaillant A-5 (1928-1936)1941 NU7 Aztec NU7

tribe. They elaborated cult ritual and so instilled the realization of the power and proximity of the gods into the minds of the people that even their arts were dedicated chiefly to religious expression. The complicated astronomic and mathematical computations that kept the solar and religious calendars in harmony with the passage of the seasons were also the province of the priesthood. The priests arrayed the dancers, who, depicting mythological events, performed a type of mass drama. Aztec life under hierarchical direction became a pattern of rhythmic ritual, and this continued ceremony served the more firmly to establish the priests as interpreters of the divine order. One has the impression that the priests never overtly showed their temporal power. Situated as they were, with the instruments for interpreting the divine will in their own hands, they had to follow the exactions of ritual far more exigently than did the masses. Were one to choose a single word to describe Aztec government, it would be theocracy. The gods ruled; the priests interpreted and interposed, and the people obeyed, not the priests, but the rhythm of action whereby the gods lived. (See Plate 58, middle.)

At the core of the religion stood the calendar, which was arranged in two divisions: a ritualistic succession of days, the *tonalpobualli* (Table XIII–XVI), and a solar calendar (Table XVII), divided into eighteen twenty-day months and a five-day unlucky period, in which the months' names related to crops and indicated the agricultural origin of this time count. A combination of the two systems permitted the numbering of years, which were counted not on an infinite scale, as with us, but in terms of a fifty-two-year cycle.[8]

The *tonalpobualli*, sometimes erroneously referred to as

[text continues on p. 190. - Analyst]

1:Vaillant A-5 (1928-1936)1941 NU7 Aztec NU7

174 quest at first. Later civil disintegration caused the Toltec decline, and the character of the Valley was transformed. Formerly, tribes had slowly grown in numbers until dense occupation of a previously unpopulated territory took place. But in the Chichimec period men were driven from their home territories by various factors, of which overpopulation may have been one, vague unrest another, and set out in search of new land. While the goal of each group of immigrants may well have been to settle and farm in peaceful isolation, the very process of movement must have brought war and consequent readjustments in the social organization.

642 Throughout Chichimec times and into the Aztec period as well, the political unit was a tribe, dwelling in its own village, supported by its own land. Even though a tribe might grow to thousands of members, the village become transformed into a city-state, and the communal lands cease to support the population, no real shift in political organization took place. No leader developed the concept of empire so successfully applied by the Incas of Peru. The group experience of the Indians was to colonize new land but, with perhaps the sole exception of Peru, never to incorporate, through conquest, weaker communities into their own tribe.

167 However, when the tribe became too unwieldly to migrate en masse, an adjustment had to be made between population and food supply. One method was for part of the population to break away and join another community whose economic resources were relatively unexploited. As an illustration we have the case of the Chimalpanecs and the Culhuas, who joined the nascent community of Texcoco to the vast benefit of its material and intellectual culture.[2]

651 648 The more usual means of adjusting food supply to popula-

1:Vaillant A-5 (1928-1936)1941 NU7 Aztec NU7

a defense carried on with that courage found in forsaken men, in this case abandoned by their very gods. We have seen, in the bitter year of 1940, the same pattern repeated when France collapsed and England found a new strength in despair.

An examination of the Mexican social structure in relation to the psychological state of the Aztec mind shows that the Spaniards arrived at a time very favorable for conquest. Comparison of the Aztec military technique with the European discipline and armament of the day reveals an exceptional opportunity for the triumph of European tactics. To explain the familiar tale of the Conquest from the Indian point of view may throw into sharper relief this conflict between two systems of civilization.

Aztec war was highly ceremonial and fought in a spirit very different from the realistic calculation of European strife. The *technical* equipment of the Indians did not meet the requirements of a conflict waged in terms of European military *practice*. Moreover, Cortes arrived at the end of the summer, when the tribes of Mexico were too busy harvesting the crops essential for their survival to think seriously of military affairs. A final factor dooming the Aztecs to inevitable defeat was the political structure of Indian Mexico, which provided no way of converting military success to the establishment of a powerfully consolidated state.

The Aztec theocracy did not lend itself to governing or absorbing conquered peoples, although in time a social mechanism might have been developed. While the Aztecs received tribute from over a wide territory, there were constant revolts and betrayals. Probably this same process went on among the other tribal groups in Mexico, so that the politi-

1:Vaillant A-5 (1928-1936)1941 NU7 Aztec NU7

cal organization of the region as a whole was far from that of an empire. In reality a multitude of independent city-states seethed with intrigue and war and were further disunited by differences in language, dialect, physical type and geographic economy. An invader, with a strongly disciplined force small enough to live off the country and thus to stay in the field, could have an astonishing success, particularly if he had a taste for intrigue. Cortes, as events proved, was the ideal man for such a purpose, and he was further favored by the psychological reaction of the Aztecs to his arrival.

The years before the Spanish Conquest had, to the Aztecs, been full of portents suggestive of future evil. There seems to have been in the air that same sense of paralysis that the French knew to their cost in 1939 and 1940. Montezuma, the war chief of the Aztecs and an amateur of witchcraft, had had an experience calculated completely to shake his nerve. He and Nezahualpilli, the chief of Texcoco, had fallen to arguing about the respective merits of their soothsayers, since the Texcocan held that strangers were going to rule the land of Anahuac. So convinced was Nezahualpilli of the correctness of his interpretation that he wagered his kingdom against three turkey cocks, the result to be decided by a ritualistic ball game with Montezuma. The latter won the first two games, but Nezahualpilli took the last three in a row. The defeat must have been disheartening to Montezuma, not only because he had so much to fear from the future, but also because his own experts had been held so cheap. (See Fig. 3.)

In close succession followed a series of phenomena, each bearing its message of woe to come. A column of fire was seen every midnight throughout the year; two temples were

14:Bandelier E-4 (no date)1880 NU7 Aztec NU7

When fifteen years old, the youth was placed in charge of certain chiefs[19] (the "telpuchtlato" or "achcacautin") who kept them under their oversight until they married. They were educated in communities "for the service of the tribe and for warlike purposes;"[20] were allowed, even at the age of fifteen, to go to war either armed or as carriers only,[21] and had their respective "school houses" ("telpuchcalco," houses of the youth); one in each of the four quarters of Mexico which formed the basis of the tribe's military organization, as we shall hereafter see. At these houses they were gradually trained to the handling of weapons.[22]

There were no regular times set for military practice. But every twenty days, at least, there occurred a religious festival, at which the warriors appeared in full costume, and, their chiefs included, they "skirmished," showing and practicing their skill in handling arms.[23] The youth were not only invited to such occa-

[19] Idem: "A quinze ans, le père présente deux fils à deux différents maitres du temple et du *collège militaire*, ..." The boy (Mexican "piltontli") then became a youth ("telpuchtli"—Alonzo de Molina. "Vocabulario en lengua Mexicana y castellana." Mexico, 1571. Parte IIa, p. 97).

[20] Bernardino de Sahagun ("Historia universal de las cosas de Nueva España," in vol. VII, of Lord Kingsborough, lib. III. Appendix, cap. IV, p. 118. "Y asi ofrecian "la criatura, á la casa de telpuchcalli; era su intencion que alli se criase con los otros "mancebos para servicio del pueblo y cosas de guerra." Also cap. V, 119). Mendieta (Lib. II, cap. XXIV, p. 124. "Los otros se criaban como en capitanias, porque en cada "barrio habia un capitan de ellos, llamado telpuchtlato, que quiere decir "guarda ó "capitan de los mancebos. . . . . Tambien tenian por si su comunidad, sus casas "y tierras, etc., etc.") Telpuchtlato signifies "Speaker to the youth" (from "Telpuchtli," youth, and "tlatoani," speaker. Molina, II, p. 141). Clavigero (Lib. VII, cap. III). Acosta (Lib. VII, cap. XXVII, p. 444. Para este efecto avia en los templos casa "particular de niños, como escuela, o pupilaje distincto del de los moços y moças del "templo"). Tezozomoc (Cap. LXXI, p. 121 and LXXVIII, p. 134). "Telpuchcalli" is derived from "telpuchtli," youth, and "calli," house. The "achcauhtli," to which we shall refer hereafter, are variously designated, even as priests (by Mendieta), as "captains of the guard" (by Torquemada), as "an officer, to whom they (the youth) were entrusted" (by Clavigero).

[21] Mendieta (Lib. II, cap. XXIV, p. 124). "Some of these youth, the strongest ones, "went to war, and the others, also, went to see how the force practiced at arms." Tezozomoc (Cap. LXXI, p. 121) "and all the youth examined, such as had not gone, went "along, carrying arms and supplies, and to become encouraged by the feats they might "witness."

[22] Mexico divided into four "calpulli" ("barrios"), each of which had its "telpuchcalli,"—"where the achcacauhtin showed and taught them the use of arms and how "to combat valorously." (Tezozomoc, cap. LXXI and LXXVIII, p. 134.)

[23] For the long list of religious festivals of the Mexicans, ordinary as well as extraordinary, we beg to refer to almost any one of the authors of the 16th, 17th, and 18th centuries, on Mexico. As to the military displays and exercises during the feast, I refer particularly to Antonio de Herrera ("Historia general de los Hechos de los Castellanos en las Islas y la Tierra Firme del Mar Oceano." Edition of 1730. Decada II. lib. VII, cap. XI, p. 187). "Nobody was allowed to carry arms about the city, but only "to war, to the chase, or when on guard to the King. On days of festivities, and at

14:Bandelier E-4 (no date) 1880 NU7 Aztec NU7

646 The existence of this council as
642 a *supreme* authority, proves the Mexicans to have been, not *subject* to the despotic rule of a monarch, but *organized* after the principles of a *military democracy*. They were a barbarous but *free* and *warlike* community.

721 *Legitimate* causes for war were frequently furnished to the Mexicans. Their traders, or those of allied or subjected tribes, were often exposed to outrage and ill-treatment on the part of and among foreign "pueblos." Such acts were always regarded as justifying open warfare, and the opportunity was speedily improved. But *pretexts*[128] were eagerly sought for also, and the Mexicans therefore never at a loss to find *some* ground for pouncing upon any tribe which excited their cupidity. We have already stated that war was carried on by them for subsistence. It [782] was further required for the purpose of obtaining human victims, their religion demanding human sacrifices at least eighteen times every year.[129] Every important event, like an improvement of the "teo-calli,"[130] and especially the installation of a new war-chief of the highest degree ("Tlaca-tecuhtli"), had to be celebrated by a special butchery of men,—and these victims had to be obtained through *war*.[131] Therefore the well-known custom of the Mexi- [726] cans, on the battlefield, to look more to the *capture* than to the slaying of their foes.[132]

[128] The war which resulted in the conquest of Chalco, the foray against Ahuilizapan (Orizava) and Cempoal, were all brought about by the most wanton provocations on the part of the Mexicans (Tezozomoc, Cap. XIX, p. 30; cap. XXI, p. 33; cap. XXXI, p. 48). (Torquemada, Lib. II, cap. XL, p. 159.) (Clavigero, Lib. IV, cap. XIII.) Durán positively denies it, saying that the Mexicans never made war unless provoked, but this is too manifestly untrue (Gomara, p. 442).

[129] These were the regular monthly festivals only.

[130] Durán (Cap. XXXVII, p. 287), when the war against Mechoacan was determined upon: "and that the main reason why he wished to measure himself with their strength "was to try to celebrate with them (by the means of prisoners taken from them) the in- "auguration of the stone, that was similar to the sun, and to tinge his temple with the "blood of these nations." Gomara ("De las guerras," p. 442, Vedia, I, "y para, como "ellos dicen, haber esclávos que sacrificar á los dioses y cebar á los soldados").

[131] It was obligatory upon the chieftain to inaugurate his administration with a military exploit, and great importance was placed upon that the head-chief should make prisoners on that occasion with his own hands. Acosta (Lib. VI, cap. XXIV, p. 431). Tezozomoc (Cap. LVII, p. 93; cap. LXI, p. 101; cap. LXXXIV, p. 147). These three passages relate to Tizoczic, to Ahuitzotl, and to the last Montezuma, respectively.) Mendieta (Lib. II, cap. XXVII, pp. 131, 132, and 133). Torquemada (Lib. II, cap. LV, p. 172, and cap. LXIX, p. 198).

[132] This was a very fatal custom, as against the Spaniards. Had the Mexicans been intent upon *killing* instead of overpowering their white enemies alive, their resistance would have been more formidable. Thus, for the sake of capturing a single horseman, they recklessly sacrificed numbers of their own, when they thought to be able to surround him, and cut him off from his corps or detachment. The custom was, however, general among the Nahuatlac tribes.

14:Bandelier E-4 (no date) 1880 NU7 Aztec NU7

proving the opportunity to advance further towards them. Meanwhile, hunger was looming up in their midst, engendering pestilence. Their bodies were weakening day by day, there were no means of subsistence left, the women and children wandered about like living corpses, without fear of Cortés' ruthless Indian allies. Still the tribe did not submit, and when, twice, the war-chiefs represented the futility of future defence, the "chief council," as supreme authority, sternly declared: "that it was better to die "fighting, than to remain in the power of those who would en-"slave and torture them."[212] At last, on the 13th of August, 1521, Cortés, advancing "across the black and blasted environs "which lay around the Indian capital," ordered a final onslaught upon the miserable remnants of the Mexicans: "huddled together "in the utmost confusion, all ages and sexes, in masses so dense "that they nearly forced one another over the brink of the cause-"ways into the water below. Some had climbed on the terraces, "others feebly supported themselves against the walls of the "buildings. Their squalid and tattered garments gave a wildness "to their appearance, which still further heightened the ferocity of "their expression, as they glared on their foes with eyes in which "hate was mingled with despair."[213] Exposed to a destructive fire from all sides, the half famished crowd attempted a feeble resistance, then scattered, preferring flight to surrender. But they were speedily overtaken and the principal chiefs captured, thus leaving Mexico definitively in the hands of the Spaniards.

We have purposely dwelt at some length on the events of the siege of the pueblo of Mexico. It is because they illustrate, better than any other page of their history, Indian *defensive* warfare, carried to its highest point of development. The Mexicans, during this memorable defence, achieved the most that any Indian tribe could achieve, up to the Sixteenth Century. Their resistance, in that respect, stands *unparalleled*. Besides, its very tenacity, the fortitude with which they bore, without yielding, the greatest sufferings, are a further evidence that what they did, was not out of fear of a crushing despotism ruling them with an

[212] Bernal-Diez (Vedia II, cap. CLIV, p. 191, and CLV, p. 194). The Council opposed the advice of Quauhtemotzin, who was for surrender:—"poniendole por delante el fin de su tio el gran montezuma," p. 194.

[213] W. H. Prescott (Book VI, cap VIII, p. 200 and 201).

14:Bandelier E-4 (no date)1880 NU7 Aztec NU7

iron hand, but by *free common consent*. It is an additional proof of the facts we have advanced: that the Mexicans were not subject to a despotical power, but organized after the principles of a barbarous, but free *military democracy*.

15:Bandelier E-4 (no date)1880 NU7 Aztec NU7

ON THE DISTRIBUTION AND TENURE OF LANDS, AND THE CUSTOMS WITH RESPECT TO INHERITANCE, AMONG THE ANCIENT MEXICANS.

BY AD. F. BANDELIER.

000 In a previous paper we have endeavored to describe the warlike customs and organization of the Mexican tribe.[1] Our conclusions in regard to them are somewhat at variance with those generally adopted, since, instead of the military despotism which heretofore has been admitted as existing in ancient Mexico, we found but the military democracy peculiar to a warlike tribe.[2] It is our purpose 121 now to investigate how far the Mexicans may have progressed in their notions about the tenure and distribution of the soil.

114 The picture which nearly all the authors, ancient as well as modern, trace of the condition of aboriginal Mexico is that of a feudal monarchy.[3] This alone should fix permanently the mode of landed tenure. It implies also the notion of abstract ownership, and thus indicates a high state of culture. But we have already

[1] "On the Art of War and Mode of Warfare of the Ancient Mexicans," in 10th Annual Report of the Peabody Museum of American Archæology and Ethnology. A[a]

[2] "Art of War, etc., etc., of the Ancient Mexicans," pp. 113, 114, 115, to 127 inclusive, especially the notes. See also "Ancient Society," by Lewis H. Morgan. (N. York, 1877.) Part II, chapter VII, "The Aztec Confederacy," pp. 188–214 inclusive.

[3] The first information tending to represent the condition of Mexico as a feudal state was probably furnished by Cortés; or through his expedition at least. The reports of the preceding voyage of Grijalva (1518) contain no positive statements. On the other hand the certificate issued by Cortés (probably about the 20 May, 1519, or 29 days after his landing at Ulua), to the chiefs of Axapusco and Tepeyahualco, already [643] speaks of "the great Montezuma, which resides in this great city of Tenochtitlán and all its provinces." We have not Cortés' first letter to the emperor, but in his second report, 30 Oct., 1520, he mentions "a great Lord called Mutezuma." (Vedia, "Historiadores primitivos de Indias," Vol. I. Carta Segunda, pp. 12 and 13.) The same dispatch contains a number of details on Montezuma's power, from which a feudal empire was necessarily construed as for inst. (p. 33): "There are in this great city many very large and fine houses, the cause of it being that all the *Lords of the land, vassals of the said Mutezuma*, [642] have their houses in that city . . . ." "What has been ascertained is: that his sovereignty was almost as large as Spain . . ." (p. 34.) Gomara, who published his "Conquista de Méjico" in 1552, already mentions "thirty lords of one-hundred-thousand vassals each, and three-thousand lords of places." (Vedia I, p. 343. "Corte y guarda de Motezcuma.") Oviedo ("Historia general y natural de Indias," Vol. III, Lib.

REPORT PEABODY MUSEUM, II. 25. a A [See 14: Bandelier, this File.--Analyst]

[p. 385]

15:Bandelier E-4 (no date)1880 NU7 Aztec NU7

114 seen that the institutions of the Mexicans were democratic and not monarchical, that their chiefs and leaders filled elective, and in no case hereditary positions.[4] This latter fact whose final discussion we reserve for another occasion, speaks strongly against the existence of privileged classes, based upon territory and landed property; therefore it also militates against feudality itself.

121 Still we cannot permit ourselves to become prejudiced by such indications, against the views generally accepted. They merely warn us of the *difficulties of our task*. These difficulties are greater yet than those against which we contended in our first essay. The military life of the Mexicans has furnished the bulk of their history, and through it a number of facts, by which the former could be almost restored. The question of distribution of the soil, however, apparently relates to *customs* only; broken up and to a great extent obliterated centuries ago. Nevertheless, accessory facts, and especially a merely cursory review of the history of the Mexican tribes, may enable us yet to form an idea of these customs. The Mexican rules of inheritance are in direct connection with them also, and lastly, the *acts of the Spaniards* during the first times after the conquest, when they more or less suddenly overturned the ancient order of things, should bring to light many forgotten features of aboriginal tenure and distribution of the soil.

Having thus sketched the programme — so to say — of our work, we have yet to offer two explanations ere we proceed to enter upon the discussion proper, itself.

In the first place: by "accessory facts," we refer to the *social organization* of the Mexicans in particular. It is inseparable from

[642] XXXIII, cap. XLVI, p. 503) again speaks of "more than three-thousand lords his subjects, each one of many vassals, and each held his principal dwelling in Temistitan, residing there certain months each year." The author, a friend of Columbus, and personally acquainted with all the eminent men of the conquest, resided at the West Indies and Xicaragua until 1556 (his stay though interrupted by at least six voyages to Spain and back), was one of the most cautious and best situated of the old chroniclers. But the chief originator of the feudal view is Fernando de Alva Ixtlilxochitl, a half breed of Texcuco, and belonging to the kin of that tribe's chieftains. He wrote about the year 1600, and both of his works, the "Relaciones historicas," and the "Historia de los Chichimecos ó reyes antiguos de Texcuco," present, it should not be denied, a picture of logical development of feudal institutions on Mexican soil. Torquemada of course concurs. We hope to be able to investigate, elsewhere, the claims of Ixtlilxochitl to the rank of a reliable source. Fairness, however, compels us here to mention the above authors, as the mainstays of current opinion.

[4] "Art of War," etc., pp. 96, 128 and 161.

15:Bandelier E-4 (no date)1880 NU7 Aztec NU7

these assumptions are disproved by the facts, related even by such authors as have most contributed towards fixing them upon the public mind as recognized truths.[16] We need hardly say here,

[16] In regard to the Tecpanecas, Acosta says (Lib. VII, cap. II, p. 477): "From this it may be inferred, that among them the King exercised no absolute command and rule, and that he was rather a consul, or Dux, than a king." He further compares the Tecpanecas with the "reges" of ancient Rome (See Morgan's "Ancient Society," Part II, cap. XI, p. 297). The council was supreme among the Tecpanecans. See Tezozomoc ("Crónica Mexicana," Lord Kingsborough, Vol. IX, cap. IV, p. 11; also cap. V, p. 12, cap. VI, p. 13, "a esto respondió el rey y senado Tecpaneca: Digéronle: mira atempanecatl (que muy bien le conocian) bien conozco la humillacion y sugecion de los Mexicanos; ya es por demas, porque estan alborotados, y corajudos los Tecpanecas:") Durán (Cap. VIII, p. 64, and 65).

The Xuchimilcas were governed by two chiefs (Tezozomoc, cap. XVI, p. 25. Durán, cap. XII, p. 104. "Their chiefs, of which there were two, one of the chief-place ("cabecera" rather lineage) of Xuchimilco called Yacaxapotecutli, and the other from the milpa (this is to be interpreted as descendancy), which is called Pachimalcatltecutli, and together with them meeting many principals, said"): a joint meal after communal style is also attributed to them by Tezozomoc (Cap. XVI, p. 26).

The Chalcas also had two chiefs: (Durán, cap. XVI, p. 134, Montezuma Ilhuicamina said to Tlacaelel: "I wish, if thou agreest, to send messengers to Chalco to the chief of Chalco Quateotl and to his companion Toteocitecutli . . . ."—Tezozomoc, cap. XXII, p. 33. Cap. XXIV, p. 36. Confirmed by the action of Cortés after the voluntary surrender of Chalco, when he installed two chiefs. Bernal Diez: cap. CXXXIX, p. 154 and 155, Vedia, II).

With the Tezcucans or Aculhuas there appears always but one head-chief, but it is equally positive that the office, while remaining in a certain kin, was elective still. The fact is interesting and requires close proof. We adduce here, in a general way, Sahagun (Lib. VIII, cap. XXX. "De la Manera que tuvieron en elegir los señores," p. 318, of 2d Vol.): Durán (Cap. LXIV, p. 496). "Montezuma sent his messengers to Tezcuco, and had all the chiefs of that city and kingdom called to learn from them whom they were inclined to elect . . . ." (p. 497), "the which came, electing for King to Quetzalacxoyatzin, Neçaualpilli's son . . . ." Tezozomoc (Cap. CI and CII). Ixtlilxochitl concurs ("Histoire des Chichimèques," cap. LXXXVI). Torquemada (Lib. XI, cap. XXVII, pp. 357, 358 and 359), acknowledges that, while the choice was among the *sons* exclusively, there still was a *choice* left, but he contradicts the statements of Juan Bautista Pomar (who wrote about 1582) who says, that this choice extended to the entire *kin* of the deceased head chief. Mendieta (Lib. II, cap. XXXVII, p. 153). "Although the Indians of this New Spain inherited the chieftaincy in direct lines, they took great care in ascertaining which one of his sons had to succeed to him." He mentions the succession in the cases of Netzahualcoyotl and of Netzahualpilli, each of whom were respectively followed by what he calls an illegitimate offspring, but whose mother was a *Mexicana* woman. Veytia (Cap. XIV, p. 367). "The council hardly had been informed of the King's death, when it thought proper to elect a successor, after the manner of the Mexicans . . . ." Carlos María de Bustamante ("Tezcoco en los Ultimos Tiempos de sus antiguos Reyes," Mexico, 1826. Part III, cap. IV, pp. 218, 219 and 220). Alonzo de Zurita ("Rapport sur les différentes classes de chefs de la Nouvelle-Espagne" translation by Mr. Ternaux-Compans, p. 12). "The order of succession varied according to the provinces, the same custom, with slight differences, prevailing in Mexico, Tezcuco and Tacuba."

The assumption of a feudal empire at Tezcuco has already been discussed. It was an invention of chroniclers, who had a direct interest, or thought to have one, in advancing the claims of the Tezcucan tribe to an original supremacy. Tribal jealousy and rivalry, such a powerful ally of the Spaniards during the conquest, continued to subsist where the Spanish domination was fully established.

15:Bandelier E-4 (no date)1880 NU7 Aztec NU7

this office may not have, at that time, been permanently established;[21]—only temporarily, for emergency's sake.[22] It is barely possible for us to follow the migrations of the Mexicans with any degree of certainty; we can but gather from the various and varied reports and traditions, that being horticultural Indians, fertile lands were sought for by them, and only when they reached the lake-basin did they begin to hope for realization of their desires.[23] —There was yet much unoccupied space around the lagunes, still the newcomers were hardly welcome to the other occupants, who harassed them so long, that at last they fled into the marsh or swamp which then covered the area subsequently converted into the western lagune of Mexico.[24] Thus they retired to ground *which was neither held nor claimed by any of the surrounding tribes*, and on the few solid patches protruding above the morass, they settled, glad to have escaped pursuit and found a resting place on

[21] We have adopted the number seven for these kinships, although the interpreter of the Mendoza Codex (Tab. I, of Vol. I, Lord Kingsborough) says there were ten. "El exercito Mexicano tubo por caudillos diez personas nombradas . . . ." (Vol. V, p. 40). Durán and Tezozomoc both say seven, so does Veytia. The two former authors even give the names of the idols which each of these seven clusters worshipped, carrying it along on their migrations. It is needless here to prove in detail the democratic nature of these seven "lineages." Veytia, for instance (Lib. II, cap. XII and XIII), quotes Chimalpain as authority, and although he assigns to the Mexicans a leader ("caudillo") called Huitziton, he still implies that at Chapultepec only "they, emulating the other nations there located, resolved upon electing a King to govern them" (p. 109). Durán (Cap. III, p. 27). Clavigero mentions an "Aristocratic" organization of the Mexicans until the year 1352. "The entire nation was below a senate or conclave of the most respected persons, distinguished through nobility and knowledge. At the foundation of Mexico there were 20 of these" (Lib. III, cap. I). This is a new version. See also Gregorio Garcia ("Origen de los Indios" Lib. V, cap. III). If we eliminate the mythical Huitziton, we find *occasional* head war-chiefs. Veytia even assures us that after Mexico was founded, they elected "one to govern them, although not in the capacity of a King, but as a leader or captain" (Lib. II, cap. XVIII, p. 159).

[22] The *regular* series of Mexican head war-chiefs ("tlaca-tecuhtli") commences about the middle of the 14th century. Previous to it, the office appears to have been filled by occasional braves, as emergency required. Compare Veytia (Lib. II, cap. XII and XIII, with cap. XV, p. 131, and cap. XVIII, p. 159, and cap. XXI, p. 186 and 187). Torquemada (Lib. I, cap. III, p. 83. Cap. IV, p. 84. Cap. XII, p. 93). Mendieta (Lib. II, cap. XXXV, p. 148), and Acosta (Lib. VII. cap. 8, p. 468 and 469), etc., etc.

[23] Motolinia (Trat. III, cap. VII, p. 186). Durán (Cap. III). Tezozomoc (Cap. I, II and III). Acosta (Lib. VII, cap. 4, p. 459). Garcia ("Origen, etc." Lib. III. cap. III, § V, p. 99 and 100. "que los haria Principes, i Señores de todas los Provincias, que havian poblado las otras seis naciones, que antes en ellos havian salido.")

[24] "Art of War, etc.," p. 87 note 3. Idem. p. 150, and note 194, 185, and p. 151, notes 197 and 198.—L. H. Morgan ("Ancient Society," Part II, cap. VII, p. 190 and 191). Among the older authors, Mendieta is very explicit (Lib. II, cap. XXXV, p. 148). "Y eso asiento les cuadró mucho por hallarlo abundante de cazas de aves y pescados y marisco con que se poder sustentar y aprovechar en sus granjerias entre los pueblos comarcanos, y por el reparo de las aguas con que no les pudiesen empecer sus vecinos."

15:Bandelier E-4 (no date)1880 NU7 Aztec NU7

[74 soil *which they might hold as their own.*[25] It would appear that, through loss of numbers in the course of their migrations, as well as through divisions among themselves, the original consanguine groups composing the body, had been reduced to *five*.[26] Now a further and last division took place, one of these kindred clusters seceding from the rest, and establishing itself apart on another sandy expanse where, close to the others however, it grew to become the tribe of Mexico-Tlatilulco.[27] It remained independent until about forty years before the conquest.[28]—The other *four* settled *each one by itself*, but still acknowledging a *common government*, in token of which the tribal place of worship was erected at the spot where these four areas met. Thus the "pueblo" of Mexico-Tenuchtitlan was founded; the seat and home of the Mexicans proper.[29]

[25] Ixtlilxochitl ("Histoire des Chichimèques," cap. X, p. 72), says that the Mexicans "asked the King of Azcaputzalco for soil" (to settle upon). Torquemada represents their settlement as a flight to a safe place (Lib. II, cap. XI, p. 92). Also Mendieta (Lib. II, cap. XXXV, pp. 147 and 148). Durán (Cap. V, p. 41), has the remarkable passage following: "que aun el suelo no era suyo, pues era sitio y término de los de Azcaputzalco y de los de Tezcuco; porque alli llegaban los términos del uno y del otro pueblo, y por la otra parte del Mediodia, términos de Culhuacan:" (This shows they were on neutral ground, dividing the tribes of their surroundings.) Tezozomoc confirms (Cap. III, p. 9), "estando en terminos de los de Atzcapuzalco, Aculhuaques Tezcucanos y los de Culhuacan." Durán (2ª p. 41) further says that they contended to be masters of their soil, without owing allegiance or obedience to any one. See also Tezozomoc (Cap. III) and Motolinia ("Epistola proemial," p. 5). Gomara ("Conquista," p. 431. Vedia, 1st volume).

[619 647] [26] We have already alluded to the number of chiefs leading the Mexicans at the time of their settlement in the lagune. It varies from four to twenty. But the fact that four "quarters" composed it originally, leads me to the belief that four Mexican kinships remained, one seceding as the tribe of Tlatilulco. This division into four is the only fact reliably ascertained. (See notes 27, 29, 30 and 31).

[27] This fact is too amply proven to need special references. How it occurred we cannot ascertain, since it is related in the most varied manner by the different sources of authority. If the statement is correct that even during their migrations, the Mexicans proper and the Tlatilulcás kept apart, as tribal components, or probably "phratries,"—then the fact of their localizing as tribes independent from each other is easily accounted for. See Veytia (Lib. II, cap. XV, p. 133).

[28] The date of its conquest by the Mexicans is about 1473 ("Art of War, etc." p. 102). It can easily be verified from the date on the so-called "calendar stone" at the city of Mexico. (See "Calendario Azteca" by Señor Chavero.)

[615 618] [29] The question remains yet undecided as to whether these four "quarters" ("barrios") were four original kinships, or whether they were already four "brotherhoods of kinships" (phratries), analogous to the Roman curiæ formed by (or rather remaining as the last vestige of) original kinships disaggregated. The latter might appear likely from the fact of the greater number of chiefs (than four), mentioned by the old authors. The existence of still lesser groups is plainly acknowledged at the same time. Durán says (Cap. V, p. 42): "On the night after the Mexicans finished the place of worship ("hermita donde su dios estaba"), a large area of the lagune being filled up and room made for the houses, Vitzilopochtli spoke to his priest or keeper and said to him:

15:Bandelier E-4 (no date)1880 NU7 Aztec NU7

618 NOT, as Torquemada admits, *assigned* to it *by a higher power*,[32] *the tribal government itself held* NO DOMAIN which it might apportion among subdivisions or to individuals, either gratuitously or on condition of certain prestations; or barter against a consideration.[33] The tribal territory was distributed, at the time of its occupancy, *into possessory rights held by* the KINDRED GROUPS AS SUCH, by common and tacit consent, as resulting *naturally* from their *organization* and *state of culture*.[34]

618 The patches of solid ground, on which these "quarters" settled,
174 were gradually built over with dwellings, first made out of canes
361 and reeds, and latterly, as their means increased, of turf, "adobe"
342 and light stone. These houses were of *large size*, since it is stated that even at the time of the conquest "there were seldom less than two, four, and six dwellers in one house, thus there were infinite people (in the pueblo) since as there was no other way of providing for them, many aggregated together as they might please." *Communal living*, as the idea of the "calpulli" implies, seems, therefore, to have prevailed among the Mexicans *as late as the period of their greatest power*.[35]

[114] [32] Torquemada (Lib. II, cap. VIII, p. 88, and Lib. III, cap. XXIV, p. 295) attributes the division into "quarters" to a "decree" of the Chichimecan "emperor" Techotlalatzin. But his assertions are disproved in part by his own statements, in part by the positive reports of other authors. Admitting even that the said Techotlalatzin should have wielded the discretionary power attributed to him, although there is strong evidence against it, he would have ruled *after* the foundation of Mexico. (Clavigero, Lib. II, cap. IX. Veytia, Lib. II, cap. XX, p. 178.) Consequently *after* the settling and localizing of the four quarters mentioned had taken place.

[642] [33] The division into "quarters" is everywhere represented as resulting from common consent. But nowhere is it stated that the *tribal government or authority* assigned locations to any of its fractions. This is only attributed to the chiefs, on the supposition that they, although *elective*, were still hereditary monarchs.

[642] [34] There is no evidence of any tribute or prestation due by the quarters to the tribe. The custom always remained, that the "calpulli" was sovereign within its limits. See Alonzo de Zurita ("Rapport sur les différentes classes de chefs de la Nouvelle-Espagne" pp. 51-65). Besides, Ixtlilxochitl says: ("Hist. des Chichim," cap. XXXV, p. 242). "Other fields were called Calpolalli or Altepetlalli." Now calpulalli (from "calpu'li," quarter or kinship, and "tlalli," soil), means soil of the kin, and altepetlalli ("altepetl," tribe), soil of the tribe. Clavigero even says that the lands called "altepetlalli," belonging to the communities "of the towns and villages, were divided into so many parts, as there were quarters in the town, each quarter *having its own, without the least connection with the other*." (Lib. VII, cap. XIV.) This indicates plainly that the kinships *held the soil*, whereas the tribe occupied the territorial expanse. The *domain*, either as pertaining to a "Lord," or to a "State," was unknown among the Indians in general. Even among the Peruvians, who were more advanced than the Mexicans in that respect, there was no domain of the tribe.

[35] See Torquemada (Lib. II, cap. XI, and Lib. III, cap. XXII). Durán (cap. V). The quotation is from Herrera (Dec. II, Lib. VII, cap. XIII, p. 190), and is confirmed by Torquemada (Lib. III, cap. XXIII, p. 291), and especially by Gomara ("Conquista de

15:Bandelier E-4 (no date)1880 NU7 Aztec NU7

shall investigate how far individuals, as members of this communal unit, participated in the aggregate tenure.

In the course of time, as the population further increased, *segmentation* occurred within the four original "quarters;" new "calpulli," being formed.[42] For *governmental* purposes this segmentation produced a new result by leaving, more particularly in military affairs, the first four clusters as *great subdivisions*.[43] But these, as soon as they had disaggregated, *ceased* to be any longer *units* of territorial possession, their original areas being held thereafter by the "minor quarters" (as Herrera, for instance, calls them), who exercised, each one within its limits, the same sovereignty which the original "calpulli" formerly held over the whole.[44] A further consequence of this disaggregation was (by removing the tribal council farther from the calpules) the necessity for an *official building*, exclusively devoted to the business of the *whole* tribe alone.[45]

[42] This successive formation of new "calpulli" is nowhere explicitly stated, but it is implied by the passage of Durán which we have already quoted (Cap. V, p. 42). It also results from their military organization as described in the "Art of War," (p. 115). With the increase of population, the original kinships necessarily disaggregated further, as we have seen it to have occurred among the Qquiché (See "Popol-Vuh" quoted in our note 7), forming smaller groups of consanguinei. After the successful war against the Tecpanecas, of which we shall speak hereafter, we find at least twenty chiefs, representing as many kins (Durán, cap. XI. p. 97), besides three more, adopted then from those of Culhuacan (Id. pp. 98 and 99). This indicates an increase.

[43] "Art of War, etc.," pp. 115 and 120.

[44] Torquemada (Lib. III, cap. XXIV, p. 295). "I confess it to be truth that this city of Mexico is divided into four principal quarters, each one of which contains others, smaller ones, included, and all, in common as well as in particular, have their commanders and leaders . . . ." Zurita ("Rapport," p. 58-64). That the smaller subdivisions were those who held the soil, and not the four original groups, must be inferred from the fact, that the ground was attached to the calpulli. Says Zurita (p. 51.) "They (the lands) do not belong to each inhabitant of the village, but to the calpulli which possesses them in common." On the other hand Torquemada states (Lib. XIV, cap. VII, p. 545): "that in each pueblo, according to the number of people, there should be (were) clusters ("parcialidades") of diverse people and families . . . . These clusters were distributed by calpules, which are quarters ("barrios"), and it happened that one of the aforesaid clusters sometimes contained three, four, and more, calpules, according to the population of the place ("pueblo") or tribe." The same author further affirms: "These quarters, and streets, were all assorted and levelled, with so much accuracy, that those of one quarter or street could not take a palm of land from those of another, and the same was with the streets, their lots running (being scattered) all over the pueblo." Consequently, there were no communal lands allotted to the four great quarters of Mexico as such, but each one of the kinships (calpules) held its part of the original aggregate. Compare Gomara (Vedia, Vol. I, "Conq. de Méjico," p. 434. "Among tributaries it is a custom, etc., etc." Also p. 440). Clavigero (Lib. VII, cap. XIV). "Each quarter has its own tract, without the least connection with the others."

[45] Compare Durán (Cap. XI, p. 87). Acosta (Lib. VII, cap. XXXI, p. 470). It appears as if the "tecpan" had not been constructed previous to the middle of the 16th cen-

15:Bandelier E-4 (no date)1880 NU7 Aztec NU7

This building was the "*tecpan*"[46] called, even by Torquemada "house of the community;"[47] it was, therefore, since the council of chiefs was the highest authority in the government, the "council house" proper. It was erected near the centre of the "pueblo," and fronting the open space reserved for public celebrations. But, whereas formerly occasional, gradually merging into *regular*, meetings of the chiefs were sufficient, constant daily attendance at the "tecpan" became required, even to such an extent, that a permanent *residence* of the head-chiefs *there*, resulted from it, and was *one of the duties of the office*. Consequently the "tlacatecuhtli," his family, and such assistants as he needed (like runners), dwelt at the "official house." But this occupancy was in no manner connected with a possessory right by the occupant, whose family relinquished the abode, as soon as the time of office expired through death of its incumbent. The "tecpan" was occupied by the head war-chiefs only as long as they exercised the functions of that office.[48]

tary,—the meetings of the tribe being previously called together by priests, and probably in the open space around the main house of worship. The fact of the priests calling the public meetings is proved by Durán (Cap. IV, p. 42). Acosta (Lib. VII, cap. VII, p. 468). Veytia (Lib. II, cap. XVIII, pp. 156, 159. Cap. XXI, p. 186). Acosta first mentions "unos palacios, aunque harto pobres." (Lib. VII, cap. 8, p. 470), on the occasion of the election of the first regular "tlacatecuhtli:" Acamapichtli,—Torquemada says (Lib. XII, cap. XXII, p. 290), that they lived in miserable huts of reeds and straw, erected around the open space where the altar or place of worship of Huitzilopochtli was built. The public building was certainly their latest kind of construction.

[46] From "tecuhtli" chief, and the affixum "pan," denoting a place. Therefore "place of the chiefs." Molina translates: "casa ó palacio real, ó de algun señor de Salno" (II, p. 33). The word is also found in the Qquichè of the "Popol-Vuh" (p. 306). "Qui tiepan quib"—Mr. E. Brasseur de Bourbourg acknowledges the Mexican origin of the word, and renders it by "to divide into quarters," although he says that in Mexican it signifies: palace or municipality.

[47] Torquemada (Lib. III, cap. XIV. pp. 269 and 270). "Tecpancalli, que quiere decir, los Palacios Reales, ó el Alcaçar, y casas de Señorio" (Id: Lib. VII, cap. XXI. p. 119. Lib. XIII, cap. XXX, p. 477). But especially in the Sixth Book, 27th chapter, page 48, when, referring to the statements of Father Bernardino de Sahagun who says, that "being in the city of Xuchimilco, he heard one night, etc. etc. . . . . and that inquiring next day why that shouting had taken place,—the Indians answered, that from the Tecpan, or community (municipal house), they had been calling the macehuales to work."

[48] Nearly every author who attempts to describe minutely the "chief-house" (tecpan) mentions it as containing great halls (council-rooms). See the description of the tecpan of Tezcuco by Ixtlilxochitl ("Hist. des Chichimèques," cap. XXXVI, p. 247. "The palace had two courts, the first and largest one serving as public square and market, for which it is still used at present. The second and interior one, was surrounded by the hall of the royal councils, where the King held two tribunals. In the centre of this court a large brasier was burning, which was never extinguished." Id. cap. XXXVIII), by Torquemada (Lib. III, cap. XXVII, p. 306. Lib. II, cap. XLIV, pp. 146 and 147. Lib. XI, cap. XXVI, pp. 354 and 355).

15:Bandelier E-4 (no date)1880 NU7 Aztec NU7

office in the *family*, and with it also the possession of certain lands, 428
attached to that officer's functions and duties. But it is quite certain too that this stage of development had not yet been reached by any of the tribes of Mexico at the time of its conquest by the Spaniards. The principal idea had not yet been developed, namely, that of the *domain*, which, in eastern countries at least, gradually segregated into individually hereditary tenures and ownerships.

There was consequently, at the time when the Spaniards first 642
came into contact with the Mexican aborigines, no established feudal system among the Indians of Mexico. Based exclusively upon kin, aboriginal society then presented to the first Europeans who witnessed it a strange and partly dazzling, partly repulsive; at all events a bewilder[illegible] aspect. It is not devoid of interest, and it is even important for us to consider what were the effects of this contact of a people imbued with the principles of medieval feudality with tribes still adhering to far more primitive ideas, upon the latter's mode of tenure and distribution of their lands.

The ostensible basis, on which the Spaniards established a 648
claim to any parts of America whatever, is expressed in the Bull of Pope Alexander VI, executed at Rome on the fourth day of May, 1493. By this act of the Holy See the kings of Spain (Ferdinand and Isabella), in consideration of their devotion to the Catholic religion, and of their zeal in propagating the Christian faith even over the remotest parts of the earth's surface, are made and created absolute possessors, for themselves, their heirs and successors, of all the lands already discovered and still to discover by them or their agents in the new world. The conditions accompanying this grant were that they "manage to send to the said mainlands and islands good men, fearing God, learned, well taught and expert, for to instruct their aforesaid inhabitants and natives in the Catholic faith, and to teach them good manners, with all due diligence."[116] This title, although it partakes of the nature of a

[116] Martin Fernandez de Navarrete ("Coleccion de los Viages y Descubrimientos que hicieron por mar los Españoles desde Fines del Siglo XV," Madrid, 1825. Tom. IIo, pp. 23-25). "Et insuper mandamus vobis in virtute sanctae obedientiæ, est (sicut pollicemini et non dubitamus pro vestra maxima devotione et Regia magnanimitate vos esse facturos) ad terras firmas et insulas praedictas viros probos, et Deum timentes, doctos, peritos et expertos ad instruendam incolas et habitatores praefatos in Fide Catholica, et in bonis moribus imbuendam destinare debeatis, omnem debitam diligentiam in praemissis adhibentes." Mendieta ("Hist. Eccles. Ind.," Lib. I, cap. III, pp. 20 and 22). Herrera (Dec. I, lib. II, cap. IV, p. 41). Gomara ("Historia de las Indias," Vedia I, pp. 168 and 169). Oviedo (Lib. II, cap. VIII).

15:Bandelier E-4 (no date)1880 NU7 Aztec NU7

423 posing the tribe; but the idea of sale, barter, or conveyance or alienation of such by the kin had not been conceived.

3. Individuals, whatever might be their position or office, without any exception, held but the right to use certain defined lots for their sustenance, which right, although hereditary in the male line, was nevertheless limited to the conditions of residence within the area held by the kin, and of cultivation either by or in the name of him to whom the said lots were assigned.

4. No possessory rights to land were attached to any office or chieftaincy. As members of a kin, each chief had the use of a certain lot, which he could rent or farm to others, for his benefit.

5. For the requirements of tribal business, and of the governmental features of the kinships (public hospitality included), certain tracts were set apart as official lands, out of which the official households were supplied and sustained; but these lands and their products were totally independent from the persons or families of the chiefs themselves.

648 6. Conquest of any tribe by the Mexicans was not followed by
651 an annexation of that tribe's territory, nor by an apportionment of its soil among the conquerors. Tribute was exacted, and, for the purpose of raising that tribute (in part), special tracts were set off; the crops of which were gathered for the storehouses of Mexico.

631 7. Consequently, as our previous investigation (of the warlike
642 institutions and customs of the ancient Mexicans) have disproved the generally received notion of a military despotism prevailing among them,—so the results of this review of Tenure and distribution of lands tend to establish: "that the principle and institution of feudality did not exist in aboriginal Mexico."

16:Bandelier E-4 (no date) 1880 NU7 Aztec NU7

ON THE SOCIAL ORGANIZATION AND MODE OF GOVERNMENT OF THE ANCIENT MEXICANS.

BY AD. F. BANDELIER.

642
121

Two previous papers have already been devoted to some of the most prominent features of the life of the ancient Mexicans, namely: warlike customs, and their mode of distributing and occupying the soil and their rules of Inheritance.[1] The conclusions of both essays were chiefly negative, in so far as they tended to establish the non-existence of a condition which has, for three centuries, been regarded as prevailing. Thus, in the first, we have attempted to disprove the existence of a military despotism[2], and in the second, the existence of feudalism[3] among the natives of Mexico. More positive results were, however, foreshadowed in both instances by the suggestion, if not by the demonstration, that aboriginal society in Mexico rested on a democratic principle. The present essay is intended to show—if the organization of the natives of Mexico was *not* as it is commonly represented—what that organization really was, according to our conception, and what status

[1] *Tenth Report of the Peabody Museum:* "*On the Art of War and Mode of Warfare of the Ancient Mexicans.*" *Eleventh Report:* "*On the Tenure and Distribution of Lands among the Ancient Mexicans, and the Customs with Respect to Inheritance.*"

[2] "*Art of War,*" pp. (127, 128, and 161).

[3] "*Tenure of Lands,*" (pp. 418 and 449). In both instances, as well as in the present discussion, the works of the Hon. L. H. Morgan have furnished to the writer his points of departure and lines of investigation; besides, the distinguished American ethnologist has watched with more than friendly solicitude the progress of all these essays. If I seize the opportunity to recall here the debt of gratitude under which I stand toward him, it is coupled with the wish to express heartfelt thanks to several of my friends, to whose liberal assistance these and the preceding pages owe their existence, nearly as much as to my individual work. Let me name here, Mr. F. W. Putnam, Curator of the Peabody Museum, Col. Fred Hecker, of Summerfield, Illinois, Dr. G. Bruhl, of Cincinnati, Ohio, and the officers of the Mercantile Library at St. Louis, Missouri. Lastly, because most remote, though certainly not least, am I deeply indebted to the great documentary historian of the City of Mexico, Sr. Don Joaquin Garcia Icazbalceta for nearly all information which could not be obtained from the usually known sources.

[See 14:Bandelier and 15:Bandelier, this file.--Analyst]

16:Bandelier E-4 (no date)1880 NU7 Aztec NU7

of progress in Institutions can be assigned to the remarkable tribe which has become so prominent in history. In other words, our object is to reconstruct the mode of government of the ancient Mexicans, the nature of its offices and dignities, and especially the principles ruling and guiding their social agglomeration.

The distinguished Mexican scholar, Manuel Orozco y Berra, explains, as well as qualifies, the condition of the aborigines of Mexico in the following manner:

"If, from the boundary-lines of the empire [of Mexico, according to his views] we now turn to the races peopling its area, we find it to be a truth undeniable that no common nor mutual tie connected these numerous and diverse tribes. Each one was independent under its chiefs.[4]"

[4] "*Geografía de las Lenguas y Carta Etnográfica de México*," por *Manuel Orozco y Berra*, Mexico, 1864, (Tercera Parte, IX México, p. 232). "Si de las demarcaciones del imperio pasamos á considerar las razas que lo poblaban, encontraremos como una verdad innegable que tanta tribu diversa no tenia un lazo comun de union. Cada una era independiente bajo el mando de sus señores. Las ambiciones particulares encendian la guerra, y la misma familia se fraccionaba. A su semejanza, cada pueblo tenia un gefe que de nombre reconocia al señor principal, y todas las provincias estaban subdivididas hasta formar un sistema bajo algunos puntos semejante al feudal. Rencores y odios apartaban las tribus, y la guerra era constante, porque siendo una de sus principales virtudes la valentia, no podian verse sin combatirse, á imitacion de los orgullosos animales que sirven de diversion en los palenques. Por instinto ó porque las generaciones son arrastradas aun á su pesar por la corriente de los tiempos, los Mexicanos emprendieron la tarea de reunir en un solo haz todos aquellos pueblos, de formar de ellos una nacion, y de asimilar sus intereses con los intereses del imperio. Para llevar á cabo semejante tarea era preciso, la fuerza para poder triunfar; un sistema proseguido con tino, y con tenacidad, y el tiempo bastante para que el odio se borrara y dejara nacer las simpatías. Pero la unidad que solicitaban los Mexicanos llevaba á las tribus al mas espantoso de los despotismos; el imperio era muy nuevo para haber alcanzado otra cosa que reducirlas á la servidumbre, sin poder contar con el amor de sus vasallos; de manera que en lugar de amigos, tenia enemigos solapados, y su grandeza era solo engañosa appariencia. En esta sazon se presentaron los conquistadores españoles. Cualquiera fuerza extraña habia de hacer vacilar al coloso; las tribus, mal halladas con la servidumbre, vieron en los invasores á quienes podrán salvarles del yugo; en su juicio rencoroso no quisieron advertir, que por alcanzar una estéril venganza aventuraban su propia existencia, y corrieron de tropel á colocarse bajo las banderas de los estranjeros." It may be interesting to compare this weighty authority with my remarks on the same subject in "*Art of War*," (pp. 109, also note 17), and "*Tenure of Lands*," (pp. 416, 417, and 418, and annotations.) The difference consists in that Sr. Orozco y Berra ascribes to the ancient Mexicans a decided tendency to "nationalize," so to say, the aboriginal people of their conquered area, to force uniformity of customs and organization upon them, and establish a true despotism. To this I beg leave to suggest in reply:—

(1). That the Mexicans, *alone*, formed only a *part* (two-fifths in amount of tribute) of that power which is commonly termed "an Empire" (El Imperio) and which was but the Nahuatl confederacy of the Mexican valley. In evidence of it I will take the liberty to quote his own words, (same part and chapter, pp. 240, 241): "El reino de Atolhuacan era el segundo en poderio; su capital era Tetzcoco, á la orilla del lago de su nombre. Pequeña hoy y sin material interes, en lo antiguo fué rival de México y

16:Bandelier E-4 (no date)1880 NU7 Aztec NU7

tion here, because of its unveiling, so to say, the full organization of the ancient Mexicans as they preserved it until the time of their downfall.

Upon the occasion of the division of spoils gathered from the defeated Tecpanecas, and of the establishment of regular tribute, there appear the following war captains and leaders of the Mexicans, as representatives of the latter's organization.

The "chief of men."

Four captains of the four principal quarters of Mexico.

Twenty war-chiefs of as many kins composing the tribe.

One chief representing the element of worship, or "medicine."

The "Snake-woman."[54]

gard to the date of its occurrence, *Bancroft* (Vol. V, p. 356), says about, or immediately after, 1431, following Brasseur de Bourbourg. *Clavigero* (Lib. IV, cap. III, p. 251), 1426, *Ixtlilxochitl* ("*Hist. Chichimeca*." Cap. XXXII, p. 217), also 1431, *Veytia* (Lib. III, cap. III, p. 165) 1431, The "*Codex Telleriano-Remensis*" (Kingsb., Vol. I, p. 7, and Vol. VI, p. 136), has it 7, "Tochtli" or 1404.

[54] *Durán* (Cap. XI, p. 96). Besides distributing land "juntamente con darce y repartiros las tierras que aveis ganado, para que tengais renta para el sustento de vuestros estados y personas segun el mérito dellas," he gave them "ditados" or titles "y (quiere) haceros señores de titulo" (the latter would be to make them noblemen). I must advert here that "ditado o titulo de honra" is expressed in the Mexican language by "tecuyotl" "tlatocazotl" "maniçoti" (*Molina*, "*Vocabulario*," Part I, p. 46). These words however mean but, respectively "chieftainship," "speakership," and "honor," (the latter see *Molina* II, p. 54), all of them terms which, as we shall hereafter see, apply to *personal merit*, and not to hereditary privilege among the Mexican aborigines. Durán then proceeds (p. 97) to give these titles as follows:—

"Primeramente á su general dió por ditado				*Tlacochcalcatltecutli.*
A Vene Motenecuma,			Tlacaelelt.zin dió por ditado	*Tlacatecatl.*
A Tlacauspan,	d.	p.	d.	*Ezuauacatl.*
A Cuatlecoatl,	d.	p.	d.	*Tlillancalqui.*
A Veneçacan,	d.	p.	d.	*Tzcacoacatl.*
A Aztacoatl,	d.	p.	d.	*Tocuiltecatl.*
A Canaltzin,	d.	p.	d.	*Acolnauacatl.*
A Tzompantzin,	d.	p.	d.	*Huetlecutli.*
A Epcotinatzin,	d.	p.	d.	*Temillotzin.*
A Citlalcoatzin,	d.	p.	d.	*Tecpanecatl.*
A Tlauiloc,	d.	p.	d.	*Calmimeiolcatl.*
A Ixcuetlaxoc,	d.	p.	d.	*Mexicaltecutli.*
A Cuauhtzitzimitl,	d.	p.	d.	*Huitznauatl.*
A Xicoooc,	d.	p.	d.	y renombre, *Tepanocatltecutli.*
A Tlasolteoti,	d.	p.	d.	*Quetzaltocatl.*
A Axicyotzin,	d.	p.	d.	*Tecuilamacazqui.*
A Ixnauhtlilloc,	d.	p.	d.	*Tlopiltecatl.*
A Mecantzin,	d.	p.	d.	*Cuauhyauacatl.*
A Tenamastli,	d.	p.	d.	*Coatecatl.*
A Tzontemoc,	d.	p.	d.	*Pantecatl.*
A Tlacacochtoc,	d.	p.	d.	*Huexotecatl.*

To these he adds (pp. 98 and 99), five more, namely: *Quauhnochtecutli, Cuauhquiauacatl, Tepicatltecutli, Cuitlauacatl, and Ilcotecatl.* The three last were from Culhuacan. Adding to this the "chief of men" himself, who was "Flint-Snake," or

16:Bandelier E-4 (no date)1880 NU7 Aztec NU7

This incident in Mexican history does not exhibit any features different from those found at the basis of tribal society, and it is not until the first decade of the sixteenth century that we are referred to the period when aboriginal institutions of ancient Mexico emerged from their former condition into that of political society proper and exhibited the features of rule as despotic as any on the three eastern continents. Even Robertson has so far yielded to this preconceived idea as to write, "This appearance of inconsistency has arisen from inattention to the innovations of Montezuma upon the Mexican policy. His aspiring ambition subverted the original system of government, and introduced a pure despotism. He disregarded the ancient laws, violated the privileges held most sacred, and reduced his subjects of every order to the level of slaves."[60] In general, many deeds, creditable and disreputable, are charged to that ill-starred "chief of men" of the Mexican tribe, whose tragical death has furnished a welcome topic to the most brilliant writers. "Wrathy chief" (Motecuzumah or Montezuma) was however innocent of many or of the most, if

seis parcialidades, que cada cual tiene sus barrios." This is indefinite and vague, and we are still left in doubt as to whether there were only six or whether there were more. The words "each of which has its quarters" would indicate that each of these "parcialidades" was divided into smaller ones. Still, "parcialidad" and "barrio" are regarded as equivalent terms, and both signify *kins*. The history of the capture of the Mexican pueblo has, in some details of the siege, preserved to us the names of some aboriginal "barrios" of Tlatilulco. *Velancurt* (Vol. II, Part. III, Trat. II, cap. VII, p. 194) mentions two of them: "Yocacolco" (with the ermita of Santa-Ana) and "Amazac" (ermita of Santa Lucia), the latter of which is again named (Cap. X, p. 206) by him, and by Torquemada also. *Torquemada* gives a number of names even: Nonohualco (Lib. IV, cap. XCIII, pp. 551, 552), Yacocalco (p. 552), Tlacuchcalco (p. 552), Amazac, Coyonacasco (p. 552). This gives the names of five barrios of Tlatilulco. If to this we add "el Barrio, que se llama Xocotitlan, que es agora San Francisco, que por otro nombre se llama Cihuatecpan," (p. 552), we would have the sixth quarter also.

That the administration of Tlatilulco remained separate from that of Tenuchtitlan is proven by the fact that Montezuma was assisted by twenty chiefs corresponding to the twenty kins of the *Tenuchca only*, and without representation for the Tlatilulca. See *Bernal Diaz de Castillo* (Cap. XCV, p. 95, Vedia II). But the war-chief of Tlatilulco was present at the council. Thus "Itzquauhtin" is frequently mentioned as the companion of Montezuma. *Sahagun* (Lib. XII, cap. XVI, p. 24; cap. XVII, p. 25; cap. XXI, p. 28; cap. XXIII, p. 31). *Torquemada* (Lib. IV, cap. LXX, pp. 498, 499). *Velancurt* (Vol. II, cap. XV, Parte III, p. 131). *Clavigero* (Vol. II, Lib. IX, cap. XIX, p. 153).

Of the hatred between Mexicans proper and Tlatilulca the last days of the siege of Mexico furnish numerous instances. Both *Torquemada* (Lib. IV, cap. XCII, p. 550) and *Velancurt* (Parte III, cap. VI of 2d Trat., p. 193) mention the flight of the former into Tlatilulco as taking refuge among enemies. Finally the following passage is sufficiently plain: *Duran* (Cap. XXXIV, p. 271), "E fué tanta la pertinacia de los Mexicanos, que hasta que los españoles vinieron á la tierra no les dejaron tornar á libertad ninguna, ni á tener templo particular."

[60] "*History of America*," (9th Edition, 1800, Vol. III, Book VII, p. 291).

16:Bandelier E-4 (no date) 1880 NU7 Aztec NU7

not all, of these good or bad actions, and this simply for the reason that he had not the power to commit them. Thus he is charged with remodelling his household, removing certain assistants, and filling the vacancies with "scions of noble stock," creating, at the same time, hereditary charges. It may be that, in the case of simple runners for instance, the "chief of men" held ample authority to select his men, consequently to remove them; but it is certain that for any office of permanence with the kin or tribe, he had not the least discretionary power. How insignificant his influence even was, when severed from organized tribal government, is amply shown by his utter helplessness from the very moment that the Spaniards had *once* treated him as a fettered captive.[61]

[61] The name is variously written "Mutizuma," "Muteczuma," "Moctezuma," "Montezuma," "Mocthenzoma," "Motecuhzoma;" and "Señor severo," is the most current interpretation. On the tables of *Durán* (Trat. I. Lam. 7, 8, 9, 21. 22, 23, 26) and in general, the "name" is painted as the head-dress ("Xiuhhuitzolli") of a chieftain, transpierced by an arrow. The etymology may be: "mo"—"thine," "tecuhtli"—"chief," and "çumale"—"furious and wrathy" (*Molina*, II, p. 28), therefore "wrathy chief," or "stern chief." Aside from the charges prefered against him by Ixtlilxochitl and his "school" of subverting gradually the basis of the confederacy, Mexican authors accuse him of having revolutionized the institutions of his own tribe. These reports have been beautifully remodelled into classical English by *Mr. Prescott* ("*Conquest of Mexico*," Book II, cap. VI, pp. 309 and 310). *Mr. H. H. Bancroft* (Vol. V, pp. 457, 473, 474, 475, etc.), is equally careful in reproducing all such tales, or a résumé thereof, in a shape more palatable to refined and impressionable readers.

The substance of these accusations becomes, however, reduced to the following statements, as expressed by *Tezozomoc* (Cap. LXXXIII, pp. 145 and 146): "He said once to Zihuacoatl Tilpotonqui: I have thought it might be well to change the manner in which the chiefs and messengers should be selected and to establish a different way from that introduced under my uncle Ahuitzotl. Let those serving within their lifetime, be dismissed and others put in their places, elected from the four quarters of Moyotlan, Teopan, Aztacualco, and Cnepopan,—which shall be children of chiefs, and shall stay at the huehuecalli, or houses of the community, with the chief-steward dwelling near by. Some of the principals of this tribe now have sons, begotten from slaves, now—these are principals, and let them become delegates (ambassadors, messengers, "embajadores"), and not be cast aside for a miserable macehual who because he is Tequihua, Cacauhtli, or Cuachic, Otomies, should therefore be set over the principal Mexican chiefs, and the sons of head-chiefs (Kings, "reyes") . . . . . What I want is to bring forth those children of chieftains, which have been forgotten so long, and that such as hold the office under the chief Ahuitzotl and your father Zihuacoatl may return to rest. . . . . Zihuacoatl then called together the council: "al palacio comun," and submitted to them this suggestion, "of which they were all satisfied." With this resolution Zihuacoatl went to the chief and said: I do not want them to be of age now, but only ten or twelve years old, that they may be instructed properly, and become skilled in speaking, well disposed, like unto pages to the chieftain. When they had come before Zihuacoatl, as second person of the chief, he made a long speech to them concerning their line of conduct: Every day you shall attend to Huitzilopochtli and to the chief, rising early for orations, and doing the same at nightfall, to become expert in the ways of penitence and sacrifice. Then you shall cleanse the temple, and the chief-house, afterwards have it swept before he comes

16:Bandelier E-4 (no date)1880 NU7 Aztec NU7

It is therefore vain to look for any important change in the institutions of the ancient Mexicans even at this third and latest date, which was the last chance, so to say, if any at all, for such

out. Keep your dresses clean and in order, also his own dress and ornaments; his tress, medal, and chain; also every five days his blow-tube and bow, that he may recreate himself with it. Attend to him at meal-time, morning and evening, serving him with cacao, roses, perfumes, with much humility and respect, never looking into his face under pain of death. Take care that the cooking be well done, and that the stewards provide for everything. But, while there you stay, beware, for many women of worth are seen there, and to whose needs you have also to attend,—watch your behavior, for should you attempt anything against them, you and your relations will be driven off, and if you commit any bad action with any of these women, your fathers houses will be razed, salt strewn over their ruins, and you and your lineage must perish." At the close of this and other (less important) talk it is said: "and in course of time they became so well bred, refined, and instructed, and skilful, that they were of the most prominent chieftains and leading men in this house and court." *Durán* (Cap. LII, pp. 416–422) does not fail to confirm the statements of Tezozomoc, extending, however, the removals to nearly all the offices: "asi en el servicio de sus casa y persona, como en el régimen de la provincia y reyno" (p. 417); also excluding illegitimate offspring ("nengun bastardo"), and giving a number of more or less pertinent details. He even asserts that the officers of the kins were removed. In short, he represents it as the introduction of absolute despotism, surrounding at the same time the throne by a powerful nobility. *Acosta* (Lib. VII, cap. 21. p. 506) and *Herrera* (Dec. III, lib. II, cap. XIV, p. 66), "porqué mandó, que no le sirviesen sino nobles, i que la Gente Ilustre estuviese en su Palacio, i exercitase oficios de su Casa, i Corte." *Torquemada* (Lib. II, cap. LIX, p. 196), *Vetancurt* (Part II, Trat. I, cap. XIX, p. 328), and others, confirm, although in a more concise style than the first named authors. It is evident that all these authors must have gathered from the same source, which cannot be *Sahagun*, nor *Motolinia*, neither *Mendieta*, nor any of the known conquerors. The story, as told and detailed by Durán, presupposes a class of hereditary nobles, already formed and in full vigor, but excluded in part from tenure of office or rather sharing such right of tenure equally with those of the common class. This is distinctly acknowledged by Tezozomoc, and more particularly yet by Durán himself: "y mudar todos los que su tio Auitzotl auia puesto y de los que se auia servido, porque munchas dellos eran de baxa suerte y hijos de hombres baxos," p. 417, etc. Now I have proven ("*Tenure of Lands*, pp. 419, 420, 421, etc., to p. 448) that there was no privileged class based on tenure of the soil. The revolution assumed presupposes that there was, up to the last "wrathy chief," no class of nobles in exclusive possession of the offices, consequently, even if the "chief of men" in question had any inclination or desire to oust the "common people" from their official positions, the main desideratum, namely, the "uncommon" ones wherewith to replace them, and for whose benefit the whole affair was planned, were not on hand. For nobility not based on hereditary ownership, or hereditary command of some kind, is no nobility at all. As far as heredity of office is concerned, Durán himself is one of the most powerful witnesses against it (*e. g.*, Cap. LXIV, pp. 499 and 499). If, therefore, "wrathy chief" created a class of privileged office-holders about the year 1503, it must have been very short-lived, for it was certainly out of existence sixteen years later, at the beginning of the Spanish conquest.

The version of Tezozomoc is evidently the correct one, and thus the whole story dwindles down to the selection of certain boys, probably of his own kin, for the special service of the tribal house of government, which took place *with the knowledge and consent of the council only*. Whether this act, if converted into a custom, might have gradually merged into prevalence of a certain kin over the rest, is another question, which the intervening conquest of Mexico by the Spaniards, has left without decisive answer. About the helplessness of Montezuma while a captive, see authors on the Conquest in general.

16:Bandelier E-4 (no date) 1880 NU7 Aztec NU7

642 646 All three we find very plainly among the ancient Mexicans.[176] Since the tribe was formed of kins associating together voluntarily, it must be admitted that they stood on an equal footing, and had, all, an equal share in the tribal government. It was scarcely possible, however, from what we know of the population of aboriginal Mexico, that all the male members of the kins, at a general gathering, could form its directive power.[177] The latter consisted of delegates, elected by the kins to represent them; which body of delegates was the supreme authority, from whose decisions there should be no appeal.[178]

[176] "*Ancient Society*," (Part II, cap. VII).

[177] There is no evidence of a general gathering of the tribe of Mexico, subsequent to the election of "Humming-Bird" (Huitzilihuitl) to the office of "chief of men." This occurrence which, according to the *Codex Mendoza* (Plate III), took place in 1396, is mentioned by *Durán* (Cap. VII, p. 53): "Y así haciendo su consulta y cauildo entre los grandes y mucha de la gente comun." *Tezozomoc* ("*Crónica Mexicana*" edited by *Sr. Jose M. Vigil* and annotated by *Sr. Orozco y Berra*, Mexico, 1878, cap. IV, p. 233), distinctly mentions delegates: "Casi con esto los mas principales, viejos, y sacerdotes de los Mexicanos, de los cuatro barrios." The "*Codice Ramirez*" ("*Relacion del Origen de los Indios que Habitan esta Nueva-España segun sus Historias.*" "*Biblioteca Mexicana*," p. 39), uses the same words as Durán. *Sahagun* (Lib. VIII, cap. XXX, p. 318), gives probably the best and clearest picture of the most important meetings of the tribe,—those for election of the chiefs, and distinctly mentions only old men, officers and medicine-men.

[178] Evidence in regard to the existence and to the supreme authority of this body is found in many authors. In the first place we have the direct admission, that they elected the "chief of men" or so-called "King," and that the "matters of government" lay in their hands, in that (yet) anonymous Relation taken from the Archives of Simancas, translated and printed by Mr. H. Ternaux-Compans under the title: "*De l'ordre de Succession observé par les Indiens*" (1*er Recueil*, p. 228): "Des conseilleurs étaient chargés des affaires d'état; c'étaient pour la plupart des gens de distinction et des tecuclis ou chevaliers comme nous les appelons. On choisissait toujours des personnes âgées, pour lesquelles le souverain avait beaucoup de vénération et de respect, et qu'il honorait comme ses pères." The supremacy of the council is positively affirmed, besides, in the following authorities:—

(1). In a fragmentary MSS. of the sixteenth century, found along with the "*Codice Ramirez*," and incorporated with the latter in the "*Biblioteca Mexicana*" ("*Crónica*," *Fragmento* 2, Cap. . . p. 147): "Considerando el nuevo Rey de México la fuerza que el español traia, juntó á consejo y hizóles representacion de aquesto, y lo que estaba prometido que de Ixtlilxuchitl habia de salir la ruina de los Mexicanos, que se diesen con buenas condiciones, pues era menos mal que no morir á sus manos y á las de los españoles. No quisieron por tener concepto destos que eran insufribles y cudiciosos. Tornóles otra vez á tratar aquesto, y aún otras dos, diciéndoles ser entónces tiempo cómodo: dijéron que querian mas morir, que hazerse esclavos de gente tan mala como los españoles; y así quedó combenido que era mejor morir; la qual determinacion sabida por Cortés andaba dando órden á Ixtlilxuchitl de como sitiar la ciudad." This shows how decisive the voice and vote of the council was, over and above the wishes and counsels of the so-called "King" (at that time Quauhtemotzin), even at the time of greatest danger, immediately before the last siege. Compare "*Art of War*" (p. 160) on the same subject.

(2). In same collection—*Fragmento* 1 (pp. 124 and 125), acknowledging the final decisions of the council at the time of the older "wrathy chief": "y assi en este tiempo

16:Bandelier E-4 (no date) 1880 NU7 Aztec NU7

642 We have already stated that the tribe was a voluntary association of kins for mutual protection. Though this was undoubtedly the original purpose, it becomes evident that, in course of time and as a result of success in warfare, the tribe, as a military organization, grew into a cluster for procuring and increasing subsistence.[288] This was achieved by gathering booty in successful raids, and by imposing tribute upon tribes whose military power had been overcome in such dashes and forays.

642 Previous to the formation of the confederacy, but few tribes had 648 been conquered by the Mexicans.[289] In fact, it was the nearly equally balanced power of the Pueblos occupying the lake basin, that made the formation of that confederacy possible. Such a course was necessary to prevent them from destroying each other for the benefit of expectant neighbors.[290] But when once this confederacy was formed, then their joint efforts were directed to conquest, and to the acquisition of the means of subsistence through tribute. As the imposition of tribute was a military measure, so, also, its collection was in the hands of the *military* branch of the tribal government. This is evident from the fact that the kins had delegated to the tribe all authority over outside [643] matters.[291] Hence the "chief of men" became the official head of tribute-gatherers.[292]

[288] "*Art of War*" (pp. 96, 97 and 98, also notes).

[289] The number and names of these tribes are yet undefined. The specifically *Mexican* sources insisting upon a *conquest* of Texcuco (by force of arms) by the Mexicans, it follows that, according to the *Codice Ramirez* (pp. 51 to 61), the tribes subjected before that supposed event, were the Tecpaneca, the Xochimilca, and those of Cuitlahuac, or the settlements to the west and southwest. *Durán* (Cap. IX to XV) and *Tezozomoc* (Cap. VIII to XX) concur; so does, of course, *Acosta* (Lib. VII. cap. XII to XV). The *Codex Mendoza* (plates V and VI) adds to the above the pueblos of Chalco, Acolhuacan and of Quauhnahuac (Cuernavaca). If we compare it with the *Texcocan* tradition, as reported by *Ixtlilxochitl* ("*Hist. des Chichimèques*," Cap. XXXI, p. 216) we notice that it is claimed for that tribe, that it assisted the Mexicans in the conquest of Xochimilco and Cuitlahuac, although the formal confederation took place (according to the same authority, Cap. XXXII) some years later. According to *Torquemada* (Lib. II, cap. XLII, pp. 148, etc.), *Vetancurt* (Parte IIa, Trat. 1°, cap. XIV, p. 201), the Xochimilcas were conquered by the confederates. According to *Veytia* ("*Historia antigua*," Lib. III. cap. I, p. 130), the Texcucans subjected Xochimilco. *Clavigero* (Lib. IV, cap. V, p. 255) agrees with the Mexican version.

[290] "*Codice Ramirez*" (p. 61).

[291] This resulted from the constitution of the tribe, as an association of kins for mutual protection and sustenance.

[292] *Tezozomoc* (Cap. X. p. 18): "y aunque enviau á darlo á Ytzcouti era para todos los Mexicanos en comun." The fact that the gathering of tribute was directly controlled by the "chief of men" is so generally admitted that it hardly needs any further proof. *Ramirez de Fuenleal* ("*Letire*," etc., p. 248, 1er *Recueil*) ascribes the gathering of tribute to an officer whom he calls "tecuxcalcatectli." This should be, properly,

782 And the commoners, the poor, only threw coarse incense into the fire. And finally the extremely poor, the poverty-stricken, the needy, the discontented, who came last, only cast aromatic herbs in the fire, thus making the offering in their own fires.[5]

642 643 431 And it is said that the lords and rulers were installed then, on the day One Dog; and there was a celebration, the royal ceremony, the rites of election,[6] on Four Reed. At that time the lords over the cities came from everywhere. There was feasting, by which it was made known that the new ruler had been installed. Many came in this manner: as their salutations, their gifts of greeting, they bore and carried wrist bands, capes, flowers, tobacco. For whatsoever their cities were famous and renowned, from wherever and howsoever far they traveled, they offered gifts and paid tribute to the ruler, and greeted him and paid him great respect. Their elders, the lords, the orators, the able speakers, who were seated, returned like for like and answered them for him.

431 And in the same manner was it done and responded. Thus was returned their gratitude, in order to reciprocate, to acknowledge, to welcome, and to provide a repast. Flowers, tobacco, drink, food, and confections were presented. But the capes came in bundles. They were only in bales. Only by the bundle were they given and presented. Each brought out first the precious capes, appropriate to them, the ones to which they were entitled, made and completed in [the ruler's] house. Thereupon they gave them their choice and pleased them. What each thought best, or sought out, or what was fitting for him, or suited his liking, or his rank, they gave the lords over the cities; [the ruler's] servants thus honored and gave preference to each [of the lords] individually.

[482] The gifts hurried, rushed, hastened, and sped borne on their backs, carried and transported by the tump lines. And the leavings, worth nothing, of no value,

auh in çan macoaltzintli, in motolinja, çan copalxalli in tleco quitema: auh in ça iequene quitzacuja, in molhujicnotlacatl, tequjicnotlacatl, in flavia, in auellamati: çan ie in jauhtli tleco quitepeoa, ic quitlamaca in jtcoian itleuh:

ioan mjtoa in tlatoque vncan motecutlaliaia motlatocatlaliaia, in jpan in ce itzcujntli: auh ipan motequaltiaia, motecpacaia, motlatocapacaia, in nauhacatl, iquac noviian oalhuja, in altepetl ipan tlatoque, coanotzalo, ic machitilo in iancujcan tlatoanj omotlali, mjiec injc oalhuj, in jntetlapaloaia, in jntetlapalol qujoalcuj, qujoalitquj in maquextli, in tilmatli, in xuchitl, in jetl, in çaço tlein imamauiçço, yximachoca imaltepeuh, in campa, in quexquichca oalcoa, quitlamamaca, quitlatequjlia in tlatoanj, ioan quitlapaloa, quitlatlauhtia, oalmotlalia in jntechiuhcaoan, in tecutlatoque, in vellatoa, in tlatolmati, quitlacuepilia, quintlananquililia:

auh çan no iuj in chioalo, in namjco, çan ic mocuepa in jnnetlaçotlaliz, injc motlaneuj, injc mjtimati, injc momalcochoa, injc mococochioa, quimonamaca in xuchitl, in jetl, in atl, in tlaqualli, in tlaqualtectli: auh in tilmatli çan quiquimjlluhtiuh, çan quiquimjlietiuh, çan quimjltica in quimomaca, in, in quimotlauhtia, quijaiacana in tlaçotilmatli, in tetechtilmatli, in vel intonal icalitic ochioaloc, otlatlan, iquac inpan quinpepena, inpan quinuelitta, quintlatlattilia, quimjipantia, quinpapantia, quinpapanjtia, in quenamj quinmacazque altepetl ipan tlatoque: injc nononqua quinmaujztilia, quinvecapano, intetlaujcalhoan.

tlaliuj, tlâtlaliuj, tlâtlalhujtiuj, tlâtlalioca, in tlamamalo, in tlâtlatqujoa, quaquailpitiuh in netlauhtilli: auh in netlacaujlli, âtle tlaçotli, âtlatlaçotli, tla-

5. Corresponding Spanish text: *"Los pobres ofrecian un encienso, que llaman copalxalli, en su mismo hogar: y los muy pobres, ofrecian una yerua molida, que se llama yauhtli en sus mismos hogares."* — In Sahagún (Garibay ed.), Vol. IV, p. 371, it is *Yaguar hierba*; see also J. E. S. Thompson: *Mexico Before Cortez* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1944), p. 185.

Bonnerot, *op. cit.*, pp. 239-240, notes that Louis Raffour, in *La médecine chez les mexicains précolombiens* (Paris: Jouve and Boyer, 1900), p. 95, identifies *yauhtli* as a species of almonbe; A. Gerste, in *Notes sur la médecine et la botanique des anciens mexicains* (Rome: Imprimerie Polyglotte Vaticane, 1899), p. 54, says it is definitely narcotic. Jacinto de la Serna's "Manual de ministros para conocer y extirpar las idolatrias de los indios," in Jacinto de la Serna, Pedro Ponce, and Fr. Pedro de Feria: *Tratado de las idolatrias, supersticiones, dioses, ritos, hechicerias y otras costumbres gentilicas de las razas aborigenes de Mexico* (Mexico: Ediciones Fuente de Cultura, n.d.), p. 249, identifies *yauhtli* as *perhuatz*, which, according to Santamaria, *op. cit.*, Vol. III, p. 298, is *"Nombre colgar que en el norte del pais, en Mexico, se da a una planta parecida al ornamental* (Tagetes minuta), *cuyas hojas huelen a anis."*

6. Cf. Anderson and Dibble, *op. cit.*, Book VIII, "Kings and Lords," p. 64. Sahagún (Garibay ed.), VIII, 18, 14: *"la fiesta de su elección, que llamaua motlatocapaca."*